

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

---

BRUCE COMMITTE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SCOTT S. HARRIS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

CASE NO. 1:17 CV 1518

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Plaintiff has filed two post-judgment motions: a “Motion for Reconsideration or New Trial” (Doc. No. 6) and a “Motion for Order Finding 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) a Violation of Poor Folks’ Right to Due Process of Law and Equal Protection” (Doc. No. 7). Both motions are denied.

Reconsideration of a judgment is warranted only if there has been: (1) a clear error of law; (2) an intervening change in the law; (3) newly discovered evidence; or (4) a showing of manifest injustice. *Jones v. Gobbs*, 21 F. App’x 322, 323 (6th Cir. 2001), *citing GenCorp, Inc. v. American Int’l Underwriters*, 178 F.3d 804, 832 (6th Cir. 1999).

Plaintiff’s “Motion for Reconsideration or New Trial” does not demonstrate any circumstance warranting reconsideration of the Court’s order dismissing this action against the United States Supreme Court, a Clerk of the Supreme Court, and another Supreme Court employee, and nothing in this motion alters the Court’s conclusion that this action was properly dismissed.

Plaintiff’s second motion, asking the Court to withdraw its dismissal order and declare

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) unconstitutional on the basis they deny “poor folks due process of law and equal protection,” lacks merit and is also denied.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 18, 2017

s/ *James S. Gwin*

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE